



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/189,112	11/09/1998	SHMUEL SHAFFER	98P7917US	5131

7590 10/21/2002
SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
186 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

HOM, SHICK C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2666

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/189,112

Applicant(s)

SHAFFER ET AL.

Examiner

Shick C Hom

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 01 February 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9-24-02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 1 line 3 delete "gateway(TFA)" and insert ---(TFA) gateway---, and in claim 1 line 4 after the words "said local area network" insert ---(LAN)---, for clarity. In claim 14 line 9 delete typo "gatekeepr" and insert ---gatekeeper---. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 5, 8-12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly

Art Unit:

point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 5 line 2 which recite "said one or more telephony devices coupled to said server" lacks clear antecedent basis because no one or more telephony devices coupled to said server have been previously recited in the claims and therefore the limitation is not clearly understood; further it is not clear as to whether it is reciting ---said one or more second telephony devices coupled to said server--- or ---said one or more telephony devices coupled to said TFA gateway--- as in claim 1 lines 9 and 7, respectively. In claims 8 and 11 line 2 which recite "said call processed by said PBX" lack clear antecedent basis. In claim 16 line 2 which recite "a ToL call" is not clear as to whether it is reciting ---each of said ToL phone calls--- of claim 14 line 7.

Claims 9-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because they depend from rejected claims 8 and 11, respectively.

Art Unit:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-5, 14, 17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swartz et al. in view of Naudus.

Art Unit:

Swartz et al. disclose nearly all the subject matter now claimed. Note Fig. 1 which shows a telecommunications system including a PBX 36, a server 32, and the telephony devices MU's coupled to the LAN clearly anticipate the telecommunications system comprising the PBX, server, telephony devices coupling the LAN as in claims 1, 6, and 14. Col. 12 lines 17-28 which recite a gateway between the PBX and the phone clearly anticipate the telephony feature access gateway coupling the telephony devices as in claims 1, 6, and 14.

Swartz et al. did not teach the server configured to provide call processing, to monitor bandwidth usage of calls it processed, including means for accounting for bandwidth requirements of telephony devices coupled to the gateway for which the server has not performed call processing as in claim 1, 6, 10, 14, the database at the server as in claim 6, message to abort or preventing a call as in claims 3 and 4, receiving and sending call setup message and an acknowledge message to inform PBX when call processed is completed as in claims 7, 8, 9, 11, and the gatekeeper as in claims 14, 19, 20. Swartz et al. did not teach the H.323 compatible server and telephony devices communicating with the H.323 server as in claims 2, 5, 12-13, and 17.

Art Unit:

Naudus teaches that it is known to provide a gatekeeper 22 for managing access to the local area network LAN and routing of telephone calls between gateways 40, 80 and access to network for H.323 endpoints including the Accounting/Authorization server 26 for ensuring network resources are available, for allocating bandwidth, and allocation and locating destination gateways whereby working together, the gateways 40, 80, gatekeepers 22 and Accounting/Authorization server 26 determine and establish call connections for data to transverse the network from a source telephone, terminal or computer to a destination terminal or computer as set forth at col. 7 lines 35-52 in the field of digital and multiplex communications for the purpose of providing an efficient added feature of DTMF/MF tones in a telephone connection on a network-based telephone system which clearly anticipate the server configured to provide call processing, to monitor bandwidth usage of calls it processed, including means for accounting for bandwidth requirements of telephony devices coupled to the gateway for which the server has not performed call processing as in claim 1, 6, 10, 14, the gatekeeper as in claims 14, 19-20, and the H.323 compatible server and telephony devices communicating with the H.323 server as in claims 2, 5, 12-13, and 17. Col. 7 lines 1-20 which recite the Accounting/Authorization server 26 being used as a central

Art Unit:

database for maintaining information relating to subscribers to a network-based telephony service clearly anticipate the step of accessing a database at the ToL server to determine if bandwidth is available on the LAN as in claim 6. Col. 10 lines 15-33 which recite sending a Setup message to the gateway and in turn receiving either a Connect message indicating acceptance of the call, or Release Complete message indicating refusal of the call and once the destination telephone network connection is made clearly anticipate means and message to abort or preventing a call as in claims 3 and 4.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the server configured to provide call processing, to monitor bandwidth usage of calls it processed, including means for accounting for bandwidth requirements of telephony devices coupled to the gateway for which the server has not performed call, the database at the server, message to abort or preventing a call, sending call setup message and an acknowledge message to inform PBX when call processed is completed, the gatekeeper, the use of H.323 compatible server and telephony devices communicating with the H.323 server as taught by Naudus to the system of Swartz et al. because Naudus teaches the desirable advantage of providing the

Art Unit:

efficient added feature of DTMF/MF tones in a telephone connection on a network-based telephone system of Swartz et al.

7. Claims 6-13, 15-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swartz et al. in view of Naudus as applied to claims 1-5, 14, 17, and 19-20 above, and further in view of Medhat et al.

Swartz et al. in view of Naudus did not teach the step of sending a message to abort call if bandwidth is not available as in claims 6, 15-16, or if exceeds a predetermined usage as in claim 18.

Medhat et al. that it is known to provide a bandwidth allocation systems which uses restrictive routing control to track connection relationships, to under-allocate and track the bandwidth available so that all of the available bandwidth in the system is not consumed, thereby preventing possible overloaded or degraded QoS whereby if a VP or VPG reaches the fixed amount of bandwidth above a level, then the VP or VPG may not use more bandwidth even if it is available in the system as set forth at col. 14 line 66 to col. 15 line 16 in the field of digital and multiplex communications for the purpose of preventing degraded QoS and congestion, and providing more effectively utilization of

Art Unit:

available bandwidth which clearly anticipate the step of sending a message to abort call if bandwidth is not available, or if exceeds a predetermined usage as in claims 6, 16-16, and 18.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the step of sending a message to abort call if bandwidth is not available, or if exceeds a predetermined usage as taught by Medhat et al. to the system of Swartz et al. in view of Naudus because Medhat et al. teach the desirable advantage of more effective utilization of available bandwidth and said more effective utilization of available bandwidth being desirable to achieve efficient system operation in Swartz et al. in view of Naudus.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Christie, IV discloses multimedia channel management through PSTN signaling.

Vaziri et al. disclose an Internet switch box, system and method for Internet telephony.

9. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Art Unit:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal
Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth
Floor (2600 Receptionist at (703) 305-4750).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier
communications from the examiner should be directed to Shick Hom
whose telephone number is (703) 305-4742. The examiner's regular
work schedule is Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:30 pm EST and
out of office on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are
unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao, can be
reached at (703) 308-5463.

Application/Control Number: 09/189,112

Page 11

Art Unit:

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

SH

Shirley Horn

October 17, 2002